DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 051 567 EA 003 566

AUTHOR Kirst, Michael W.; Grossman, David L.
TITLE Politics of Elementary and Secondary Education. Research Workshop Report. Working Document.
INSTITUTION National Academy of Education, Stanford, Calif.; National Academy of Sciences - National Research Council, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jan 71
NOTE 61p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Decision Making, Educational Finance, *Educational Policy, Educational Research, Elementary Education, *Governance, Political Influences, *Political Power, *Political Socialization, *Public Policy, Secondary Education
IDENTIFIERS Politics of Education

ABSTRACT

This report, the result of a 5-day conference on the politics of education, reviews the four research focus areas covered during the conference: (1) new goals and objectives for educational institutions, (2) the political education of youth, (3) analysis of the governance of educational institutions, and (4) the study of input/output/feedback relationships in educational policymaking. All conference papers proferred specific suggestions for urgently needed research in the politics of education. (JF)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED051567

WORKING DOCUMENT

RESEARCH WORKSHOP REPORT

POLITICS OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Stanford University
Stanford, California
September 14-19, 1970

Sponsored by the

COMMITTEE ON BASIC RESEARCH IN EDUCATION
DIVISION OF BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES
NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES-NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL

and the

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF EDUCATION

Workshop Director: Dr. H. Thomas James, The Spencer Foundation
Workshop Coordinator: Dr. Michael W. Kirst, Stanford University

EA 003 566

January, 1971

Prepared by

Michael W. Kirst, Workshop Coordinator

with the assistance of

David L. Grossman
Stanford University

Table 1

PARTICIPANTS IN RESEARCH WORKSHOP ON POLITICS OF

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Stanford University

September 14-19, 1970

Joel S. Berke
SURC
723 University Avenue
Syracuse, New York

Daniel Elazar
Department of Political Science
Temple University
Philadelphia, Pa.

Herbert Jacob
Department of Political Science
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

Edgar Litt
College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
University of Connecticut
Storrs, Connecticut

George Lanoue
Columbia Teachers College

Kenneth Prewitt
Department of Political Science
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

Ira Sharkansky
Department of Political Science
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

Sheldon Wolin
Department of Political Science
University of California
Santa Cruz, California

David Minar
Department of Political Science
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illionis

Stephen K. Bailey
SURC Policy Institute
Merrill Lane
University Heights
Syracuse, New York

Patrick Crecine
Department of Political Science
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Laurence Iannaccone
Ontario Institute for Studies
in Education
102 Bloor Street West
Toronto, Ontario
Canada

Michael Lipsky
Department of Political Science
MIT
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Norton Long
R.F.D. 1
Sidney, Illinois

Paul E. Peterson
Department of Education
University of Chicago
5835 Kimbark Avenue
Chicago, Illinois

Robert H. Salisbury
Department of Political Science
Washington University
St. Louis, Missouri

Frederick M. Wirt
School of Education
University of California
Berkeley, California

Harmon L. Zeigler
Department of Political Science
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon

Hendrik Gideonese
Bureau of Research
U.S.O.E.

Edward Greenberg
Department of Political Science
Stanford

Hans Weiler
Departments of Education and
Political Science
Stanford

John Meyer
Department of Sociology
Stanford University
Stanford, California

Heinz Eulau
Department of Political Science
Stanford

Robert Hess
School of Education
Stanford

H. Thomas James
The Spencer Foundation

Michael W. Kirst
Stanford University

BACKGROUND, PARTICIPANTS, AND PROCEDURE

The politics of education is a new and still largely uncharted area of research concentration. As recently as 1959, Thomas H. Eliot presented the need for a beginning of research in this field in the American Political Science Review. In 1969, AERA had enough interested members to form a special interest group concerned with the proper scope, methods, and objects of inquiry.

Neither of the parent disciplines -- political science or education -- has provided clear concepts or ready-made, tried and tested, methods for study of educational politics and policy formulation. The reform of school administration in the early 1900's sought to divorce education from overt political conflict. This reform tended to remove incentives for scientific research that questioned the tenet that politics and education do not mix and deflect concern from the intersect of politics and education. Students of the government of education usually paid their way by seeking answers to questions of urgent interest or importance to school administrators (particularly how to raise more money). Studies dealt largely with internal and stable aspects of educational institutions and practices, delimited in scope to specific program areas, educational levels, states or localities, and so on. Moreover, the value educators attached to isolation of their activities from general government may, to a large degree, explain the absence of research directed to the comparison of public school systems with other social institutions having education-related goals.

A number of environmental influences in the last decade have brought about a significant change in research preoccupations. Funds

from U.S.O.E. and private foundations stimulated work by a variety of social scientists from other disciplines. Legislators began to ask for more precise evaluations of the results of formal schooling before assenting to the open-ended cost estimates of schoolmen. Far reaching proposals to change the traditional relationships among the three levels of educational government were widely discussed across the country by such scholars as Conant, Gardner, and Heller. At the local level, parents, teachers, minority groups, and students have gone into action to redistribute political influence previously held by professionals. Research focused on curriculum change, school desegregation, community involvement, etc., raised questions about political structures and processes that would impede or encourage educational change.

Lindblom has described public policy-making as marked by "complexity and apparent disorder," a statement equally applicable to the present study of educational politics. Research still tends to deal with a single level of government, with a restricted set of variables, or a small number of units, studied in depth. Recent studies have highlighted different components of the educational-political system, but the units of analysis are not yet numerous or broadly enough defined to be fully representative; and the research designs are not sufficiently similar to provide the basis for amassing cumulative or comparative findings. We have little insight into the functioning of political processes over time or the relationship between the various federal levels and branches of educational government. Efforts to study the effects of school bureaucracies on policy formulation and implementation have lagged. Political socialization research has been limited by a model which conceptualized socialization as the

transmission of belief systems [redacted] and behavior patterns from adults to pre-adults.

In short, little agreement exists about priorities or theory to guide research. Political norms in education policy making have not been seriously considered. As was the case in the early discovery of America, a variety of explorers have staked out and laid claim to sections of unsettled terrain. Little attention has been given to the development of conceptual or normative frameworks; rather concepts and constructs previously put forward by various social scientists have been adopted, and imported models have tended to suggest rather than control the research design. Research designs using survey techniques and multiple regression have tended to mask political variables. Case studies have limited usefulness for building generalizations. Political systems analysis has been used as window dressing but has yet to prove rewarding as a method for studying the politics of education. The political aspects of the future of American education have been largely unexplored.

These are common deficiencies of a new field of inquiry, and should not be attributed to the insensitivity of the researchers. The conference hoped to use this rather unexplored research focus of politics and education to try out some new approaches and avoid the pitfalls experienced in other research areas in political science. Conferees were selected from the following aspects of the relationship between politics and education.

- the interaction of political and educational institutions, i.e., the ways in which the politics of community, state, and nation affect the operation of educational institutions.

- the political analysis of educational institutions, including processes of bargaining and decision-making, and models of governance.

- the contribution of education to the development of political institutions and behavior, including patterns of political socialization and recruitment.

Some of the participants had worked extensively in one of these areas, and others have completed research that could be related to education and politics thereby providing new insights (see Table 1). Ideally, the conference could have mapped the conceptual boundaries of the whole research field of politics and education and, then, derived an explicit ranking of research topical priorities. The lack of theory from either political science or education, however, to guide our efforts impeded such an outcome. A sound way to rank research priorities is through the contribution of a proposed study to an overall theoretical structure - but we have no such theoretical structure. Recent conferences in political science were not fruitful in finding priorities for research in that entire discipline because of the same problem.[1]

Given limits on the state of the art, the pre-conference papers were designed around the following charge: "If you were to study something that would contribute the most to this field, what would you study and how would you do it." Two of the participants (Eulau and James) were asked to prepare opening presentations on the boundaries and intersect between education and politics. Through this procedure the conference

---

[1]Heinz Eulau and James C. March, Political Science (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1969).

could begin with several specific research proposals and then could proceed to explore linkages, gaps, and sequencing. This approach proved to be useful in that the papers fell into four distinct clusters with each cluster representing considerable internal similarity in orientation. The Cluster and their participants are listed below:

THE FOUR RESEARCH FOCUS AREAS AND PARTICIPANTS

CLUSTER I:

NEW GOALS AND OBJECTIVES FOR EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS: STRESS ON NORMATIVE ANALYSIS OF PUBLIC POLICY ALTERNATIVES AND RE-EXAMINATION OF PRIOR ASSUMPTIONS UPON WHICH RESEARCH IS BASED

BAILEY
GREENBERG
MINAR
SALISBURY
WOLIN
EULAU

CLUSTER II:

THE POLITICAL EDUCATION OF YOUTH: NEW DIRECTIONS IN RESEARCH ON POLITICAL SOCIALIZATION INCLUDING CROSS-CULTURAL STUDIES

HESS
LITT
MEYER
PREWITT
WEILER
JACOB

CLUSTER III:

AN ANALYSIS OF THE GOVERNANCE OF EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS: ESPECIALLY ISSUES OF POWER, ROLE, AND DECISION-MAKING

GIDEONESE
ELAZAR
IANNACONE
LA NOUE
LIPSKY
PETERSON
ZEIGLER
WIRT
KIRST

CLUSTER IV:

THE STUDY OF INPUT/OUTPUT/FEEDBACK RELATIONSHIPS IN EDUCATIONAL POLICY-MAKING -- INCLUDES ANALYSIS OF THE DISTRIBUTION OF FINANCIAL INPUTS AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO OUTPUTS

BERKE
CRECINE
JAMES
LONG
SHARKANSKY

After initial discussions, Cluster IV disbanded and redistributed its membership among the other three. Consequently, the viewpoints of this cluster were integrated with the other groups.

After an opening discussion on the intersect and boundaries of politics and education, the conference proceeded through small group discussions within each cluster, preparation of cluster reports, and then critiques of these cluster reports by all conferees in general sessions. The final reports written by participants were by a reporter for each cluster. Given the lack of theory and embroyonic state of the prior research there was no logical way to rank priorities among the three clusters. Presumably people who are interested in research relating politics and education will choose among the three based on their own interest, values, and views of national priorities.

BRIEF OVERVIEW OF THE PRE-CONFERENCE PAPERS

The conference objectives were met in a significant way before the conference began. The pre-conference papers generated a high quality of proposals addressed to the research gaps, and new paradigms for the study of education and politics. Since part of our aim was to galvanize experienced researchers to think about ways to study an

emerging field, of inquiry, the papers provide specific suggestions and insights on useful methods. In total the papers display ~~different~~ a range of orientations from those who had been active in research in this specific area for several years, to the newcomer who saw important applications from his prior work in education. The former was closer to the interests of the educator in the field and the latter was more concerned with the contribution of the educational domain to the development of political science ~~sense~~ of normative inquiry.

The brief summary of the papers provided below is not designed to reflect the multitude of specific research proposals and approaches mentioned in the papers. Rather the objective is to highlight some of the general themes and show the derivation of the four clusters. Given the amount of information and analysis in the papers, those interested in this field need to read the papers themselves.

> Cluster #1 - Establishment of new goals for educational institution: stress on normative analysis of public policy alternatives and a re-examination of normative assumptions upon which prior research is based. (Wolin, Greenberg, Salisburg, Barley, Eulau)

Most of the participants in this cluster contended that we are in such a crisis in our educational system that we need to question old assumptions and concepts of the goals of public education. As Sheldon Wolin emphasized:

> Civic man is, in large measure, the product of our schools, and the future vitality of our civic life and its values is being determined in the present. If, in the midst of a profound political crisis affecting education, it is proposed that we study the latter by means of a theory which assumes that the former is functioning normally, the results are bound to be misleading. The task which confronts us requires a political theory that will illuminate both politics and education, but it must be a theory which starts from the

> assumption that the society is in deep trouble, proceeds by searching for a formulation which identifies those troubles, and concludes with some sketch of the possiblities, necessities, and dangers for a better politics and a better education.

Wollin eschews the use of systems analysis for studying education and politicals because:

> Political theories deal with structures which embody and exercise the most awesome powers of which man is capable of concentrating. On some occasions these powers are used violently and destructively; more often they are used to intimidate ... In the case of systems theory these distortions are crippling. It enables its exponents to talk about 'outputs' but not about distributive justice or fairness; about 'steering' but not about statecraft; about 'messages' or 'inputs' but not about the quality of the citizens or their lives.

Wolin also questions the validity of Lindblom's ~~contention~~ concept that the "political system" has exhibited a natural and healty genius for slow, piecemeal, incremental advance as a basis for researching politics of education.

Wolin does not claim he has the theory but he did advance the notion of a "technological society" as portraying the future direction of American society. He proposes we should project the nature and characteristics of this technological society into the future, explore its implications for the educational system, and if we do not like the future impact of the technological society on humanism decide how to establish through education a "counter culture." He concludes:

> There can be no theory of technological society which is not also a theory of evil, and hence there can be no politics and no education worthy of their names which are not committed to countering many of the forces and promises of the new society and to preserving, rather than merely redefining, what is human

Edward Greenberg applies some of the concepts and viewpoint of

Wolin to the "civic miseducation of American youth." He also contends we are in the midst of a public crisis "which threatens to tear asunder the fragile network of sentiment and shared loyalities that constitute the social fabric of a people." Greenberg argues the current picture of American politics that students receive in the educational system (largely through civics and history courses) is inaccurate and breeds cynicism among the young. He outlines his view of the dominant paradigm of political science (or social studies textbooks on American government. In view of recent events, he asserts this paradigm is filled with anamolies:

> We are, I believe, in that disconcerting period of time when the old has lost its ability to make sense of the world, but a new formulation has not arrived to fill the gap. The young who have no strong attachment to older perspectives are conscious of the turmoil and are searching for new ways to deal with the world. We would do well to emulate some portion of their behavior by beginning to seriously re-examine the way we perceive the American policy.

Both of these papers raise basic questions about the connection between the learner, learning, and the society, and (introduce the provactive comments on this (topic by Heinz Eulau. Eulau proposes a 180° turn in the values and assumptions underlying most research relating politics to education. Much of our (prior research on political development and socialization, for instance, proceeds from the assumption that the good society will emerge if proper socializing and educational procedures harness the right components of the political culture in the right direction. Eulau questions this underlying research assumption that the good political order is created out of a good educational system. He points out, however, this viewpoint can be traced to Plato's

observation that education is not an end but the means by which human nature can be shaped in the right direction to produce the harmonious state.

Eulau posits it is more likely that the relationships between politics and education is the other way around. Government and societal happenings are the independent variable and education is the dependent variable.

> If the political order is sound, stable, legitimate, just or whatever other criterion of "goodness" one wishes to apply, education and all that is implied by education, such as the creation of new knowledge or the transmission of traditional knowledge, flourishes. If the political order is in trouble, education is in trouble. If we were to follow Plato or for that matter Aristotle who believed that education is prior to politics, we would have to conclude that our public troubles - the war in Vietnam, poverty in the ghettos, pollution of the life space, and so on - are due to our educational system. Of course, John Dewey and Dr. Benjamin Spock have been blamed, but I seriously doubt that we can take such scape-goating seriously. On the contrary, therefore, if we find our educational system wanting, I think we should try to look at the public order rather than, as we have done so much in education, contemplate our navels as if the outside world did not exist.

If we start from the premise that the political process and the condition of political affairs make education what it is, then we have a basis for investigating many of the objectives of the schools that are merely specified in public. For example, conference chairman H. Thomas James ~~postulating~~ contends ~~that~~ the functions established by the political environment ~~that~~ for the public schools overshadow the more widely discussed functions of teaching subject matter and basic skills.

> First and highest priority is a high-security system of custody to see that the peace is kept by children in the

> in the city. The second priority is that children shall be taught to dress, speak, and behave in ways that will not outrage the majority of the adult population most frequently exposed to them. The third, which by all odds leads to the most significant and pervasive characteristics of the successful graduate of the American school system, is teaching children to look interested and attentive, even though thinking about something else.
>
> That the highest priority is custodial and readily demonstrated. No failure of the school in any conceivable function. . .is capable of focusing the public's attention so quickly as a reduction of the custodial services such as, for instance, putting children on half-day sessions.[1]

Stephen Bailey returns to the theme underlying the Greenberg and Wolin's paper - the use of education as an independent variable to create a better society. His paper stresses normative political speculation about the personal and social functions of education. At the core of Bailey's paper is education for life styles that "maximize the incidence of inner joy over time," and that minimize the frequency and severity of the inevitable pains that accompany and infuse human experience.

> Is there an emerging moral structure that can fill the void left by the dissappearance of traditional norms. If a new moral system is not rapidly apparent, are there bits and pieces lying around? Can these bits and pieces put together at least a foundation for the longer future and, building upon such a foundation can contemporary education be redesigned or modified in such a way as to give young people hope and confidence that a combination of societal and personal attributes can be cultivated that will substantially increase the sum and intensity of joy in the world.

Robert Salisbury is also concerned with charting goals for education but he emphasizes the required redirection of research to direct consideration of how major social change can be effected to

---

[1] H. Thomas James, "Quality Education: Whose Responsibility?" Speech in Buffalo, N.Y., August 19-20, 1969.

accomplish concrete goals. In three midwestern states he proposes to ask education - elites their perceptions of "the problem" in public education and to outline a political strategy for major innovation, e.g. how they would bring about the changes necessary to correct whatever he thought was wrong. The second study phase would focus on two policy objectives - 1) the separation of financial support from policy making and administrative control and 2) making the administrative structure more responsive (e.g. decentralization and community control). Salisbury's stress on the usefulness of elite viewpoints clashes with the position of Wolin and Greenberg.

Cluster #2 - The Political Education of Youth: New Directions in Political Socialization Research including Cross Cultural Studies.

A common theme of these writers was to challenge the historic strategies, assumptions, and underlying values of prior research on the political education of youth. Hans Weiler argues the maintenance of a political system constitutes only one of the possible frameworks for the conception of political socialization, and should be supplemented by the inherent conflictual properties of political systems in general, and pluralist systems, in particular. He advocates a re-examination of the dominant research assumption about the need for a substantial congruence between the outcome of the ongoing political socialization process, and the belief system already prevalent in the political system. On the basis of these arguments he elaborates on a concept of "conflict socialization," primarily in terms of the capacity for dissent toleration or - in terms of group psychology - of the "latitude" of accepting deviant,

dissenting, or nonconformist types of politically relevant behavior.

Robert Hess pursued some of the same lines of inquiry pointing out in 1961 he was explaining why American youth were so uninvolved in political controversy. He concluded it was because the socialization process was unusually effective and the system secure. Trust and confidence in the system were high, so why get worked up about politics. The contemporary scene is obviously quite different and it is difficult to explain it by applying traditional socialization modes to political behavior in young people. A few years ago he was stressing models of political learning (rather than socialization) that made allowance for acquiring political attitudes and behavior. He concludes.

> The major concern I have at the moment about political socialization in this country is the extent to which political behavior in young people is learned or whether it is spontaneously derivative from a confluence of internal states and external pressure and appeals. . . Occasionally, I wonder if the origins of political behavior in pre-adult cannot be better understood in terms of alignments and emotional sympathies rather than formal learning.

Edgar Litt pursues Hess' conception of political learning in a specific direction. He laments that too often research has tapped student responses within closed educational systems as if political learning was equated with cognitive learning within formal educational systems. In his view, experimental learning in which the young cope with the realities of politics in America becomes the only way of breaking the binds that have gripped researchers. He advances a specific design for experimental research in order to discover what values are capable of being changed by politics and which are simply incapable of being negotiated, modified, or changed in any fundamental way.

Kenneth Prewitt and John Meyer turned their attention to a different aspect of political socialization. Schooling is socially chartered to direct students toward adult social and political status positions. Schools help define these positions as well as legitimate the assignment of differentially educated people to them. In so doing schools are affected by and affect the political structure of society.

In short, school structures provide an important means of legitimating a whole system of inequalities, both in the eyes of students or graduates, and in the view of sectors of the adult population including government officials.[1] Clearly when we view schools in this light we see a broader intersect between schools and the political order than if we concentrate on school board decision making or the attitudes of children toward political parties, and we also see the political stress inherent in our educational institutions that are responsible for teaching youth about the American ideal of equality and at the same time sorting people out to unequal social-economic positions.

> Cluster No. 3 - An Analysis of the Governance of Educational Institutions: Especially Issues of Power, Role, and Decision Making. Lipsky, Iannaccone, Elazar, Peterson, Zeigler, LaNoue.

This cluster focusses on the governance of public education including such things as models of decision making, roles, federalism, and bargaining. Their concerns center around who runs our schools and the policy implications of changes in the influentials. For instance, Harmon Zeigler asserts little is actually known about the relative distribution of

---

[1] "Proposed Guidelines for Research on the Political Effects of Schools and Schooling," part of a report of a conference sponsored by the National Research Council on Education and Politics at Stanford, Cal, September 14 - 19, 1970.

influence among various potential and actual participants in the educational-decision making process. He contends:

> Our first task is not more theory. Our job is to compile a list of participants in governing the schools and assess the influence of each. I suggest we consider the activities of the following participants: 1) administrators, 2) school boards, 3) teachers, 4) interest groups, 5) students.

Professor Peterson suggests three decision making models through which these various actors make policy - the organizational process model, the political bargaining model and the rational decision-maker model. He stresses each model presents only one facet of the totality of the situation and only by inter-relating the three models does the full picture emerge.

Professor Lipsky, Iannaccone, and Elazar concentrate on specific actors or models for decision making in public education. Building on his prior work on street level bureaucrats Lipsky proposes a study of teacher/client interactions including: 1) incentive systems in which teachers work and 2) recruitment and maintenance of employees within the school systems. One objective would be to provide a critical link in our understanding of the relationship between student achievement and intervening variable of client encounter with the system.

Professor Elazar would combine the systems and policy making process to explore community control. Among other things he proposes to tackle the unsettled issue of what is "the community" and the implication of the federalist system for community-self government.

Professor Iannaccone believes priority should be on the local education agency, particularly the growing gap between policy studies and planning versus implementation and administration. His experience with preparing school administrators leaves him troubled about the development

of outside networks of a "new intellectual proletariat" without responsibility for the action. He does not defend the establishment but proposes researching the "gap between planning and action," and the consequent lack of change within the local educational agencies.

> Cluster No. 4 - The study of input-output-feedback relationships in educational policymaking - includes analysis of the distribution of financial inputs and their relationship to outputs (Sharkansky, Crecine, Berke, Long, Jacob).

This cluster proposes to explore various aspects of the input-output-feedback process in education policy making. Professor Crecine asserts we should be interested in political variables only if they turn out to be important determinants of educational outcomes. A logically prior decision is to determine which set of outcomes one is attempting to explain, predict, etc. Professor's Long, Sharkansky, and Berke accept this premise and nominate some specific outputs. Sharkansky focusses on intra-state distribution of educational spending. His proposal rests on the assumption that policymakers do <u>not</u> make their decisions only with an eye toward macro-levels of state performance. This issue is not how much for the whole state but which districts within a state should get how much.

Professor Berke advocates a concentration at even a lower level of financial distribution - e.g., the distribution of funds to individual schools within a given school district. We have some evidence that poor and black students are getting less resources within a single school district, and we need to explore the patterns of resource allocation and the political processes through which these patterns are established.

Professor Long picks up the other strand of Crecine's viewpoint and criticizes the identification of quality of educational input with

quantity of dollars output. Among various studies the Coleman report suggests the critical importance of the environment outside the four walls of the school for pupil attainment. Long would research the politics and sociology of a school's environment that dispose children favorably or unfavorably for educational attainment. Part of this is the sense of efficacy of the child. He suggests starting with study locations where literacy would widely diverge from what census characteristics of neighborhood population would lead one to expect.

Professor Jacob is more concerned with the feedback part of the process than the outputs. In particular, he would research circumstances which evoke altered demand and support for the educational system. He is also interested in the set of characteristics of those who respond and those who remain passive to particular action by educational authorities.

Professor Crecine encompasses all of the above with his view that:

> The most important kind of investigation to conduct is one that might be labelled 'uncovering educational production functions'. What we really want to know first is what inputs in the actual educational process we would like to change in order to get what predictable changes in a particular set of outputs.

He reviews studies on production functions and finds we know "very, very little about the technology of producing educational change". Consequently, it is hard to see where detailed political knowledge of the existing process of financing and delivering educational services could be very useful. The same can be said for political factors that determine the formal educational system because this may not be very important. Crecine then goes on to suggest how better studies of educational production functions may be implemented, and the relationship of politics to research-

ing the causal variables.

Summary

The papers present a fascinating and stimulating array of research suggestions. The range is enormous and the approaches differ in fundamental ways. There is a recurring theme that we should not repeat some of the false starts in other policy areas in this emerging area of education. This theme is highlighted by frequent assertions that education is in a crisis, and consequently,we need to discard fundamental assumptions and implicit values upon which prior studies are based. There is not much detail on the methods for implementing particular studies - rather there is a questioning of what we should research and an unease that the more fashionable methods will probably not get us where we need to go. This leads us to an analysis of the outcome of the conference discussions.

Research Guidelines: Cluster I

What was distinctive about the research concerns of Cluster I, as opposed to those of the two remaining Clusters, was a general reaction against the paradigms commonly used in the study of the relationship between politics and education, and beyond that, for some of the participants at least (e.g. Wolin, Greenberg), a reaction against those paradigms used in the discipline of political science generally. While, in the main, Cluster II dealt with the interface between political and educational processes, and Cluster III with the outputs of educational and political systems, Cluster I challenged the processes and outputs themselves and their underlying assumptions. Rejecting such well-known modes of analysis as systems "theory", political socialization theory, or production function models, this group instead focused on the search for new goals for the study of politics and education.

As might have been expected from the nature of the task they accepted, Cluster I became, at once, both the least defined and the most controversial of the three Clusters, and the intra-group conflict was only supressed by the arguments at the meetings of the whole. Still, certain common themes did appear, or can be extrapolated from the participants' papers, their discussions, and their final report. These themes should bear on the formulation of future research questions in the study of the politics of education.

As suggested by Bailey in this Cluster's final report to the Conference, the concerns of Cluster I fell basically into four areas:

(1) broad speculative questions about norms - including questions

of what kind of world/society do we want, and what does the educational system have to do with getting us there;

(2) questions of assumptions - about nature, man, society, etc.; here emphasis was also placed on the question of the nature and direction of the relationship between politics and education, i.e., the question of the dependent versus independent variable in the relationship between politics and education raised in Heinz Eulau's paper, and repeated in the introductory section of this report.

(3) descriptive and analytic questions of how views/values/goal are formed in the educational system; and

(4) a series of instrumental questions dealing with possible alternative goal formations, including questions of what is researchable, and questions of how do we get from here to a more desirable there.

As broad, encompassing, and open-ended as these four areas of speculation may seem to be at first glance, the actual discussion of these issues in Cluster I was framed within a particular context. That context was provided by Sheldon Wolin's conference paper, "Politics, Education, and Society." In his paper, Wolin offers us a tentative outline of an alternative paradigm (in particular and vehement opposition to "systems theory") which he hopes will from the beginnings of a new theory of the politics of education. While it is not possible or useful to completely recount Wolin's proposal here, some discussion of it is necessary to provide a basis for understanding Cluster I's proposals.

In brief, Wolin offers us a new paradigm for the study of politics and education, that of "technological society" or more broadly, "technological culture." As Wolin himself explains,

> Today there is scarcely a sphere of society or a major aspect of human activity which is not infected by a technological component. There is daily confirmation that contemporary politics is mostly about the future imperatives and past consequences of technology; that education is increasingly affected by it; that, in short, our society can be most accurately described as technological. Neither politics nor education, nor any combination of the two, can be properly understood apart from the technological society. (See Wolin, pp 9-10)

In his paper Wolin proceeds to enumerate some of the possible characteristics which his paradigm, or incipient theory, of the technological society might include. In harshly abbrieviated form these concepts are as follows:

(1) Like all previous societies, technological society constitutes an order but of a distinctive kind.

(2) Although many previous societies have accorded a high place to the pursuit of knowledge and to the value of "useful" knowledge (and have supported the institutions of knowledge) technological society is not only deeply dependent on knowledge, but particularly reliant upon knowledge which is systematic and interlocked.

(3) Technological society is not classless; the destruction of work and the everchanging demands of technology (e.g. new complex skills) threaten the lower classes with permanent subjugation.

(4) Technological society accentuates concentrations of power and influence.

(5) In technological society it becomes increasingly difficult to alter or significantly modify the society by means of political action.

Much of the early argument in Cluster I focused on Wolin's conception of the "technological society" and its implications for the goals and processes of educational institutions. As Salisbury summarizes these

implications in Cluster I's final report:

> First is the rapidity of changes in environment, in work roles, and in nearly every aspect of one's physical and social circumstances. Secondly, there is the steady shrinkage in the social requirements for physical labor in the production of goods. Third, is the probable drive for increased efficiency and/or stability in the allocations of resources with the result that pressures will mount to close out deviant or dissonant activities and groups.

While it must be said that not all of Cluster I (much less the whole conference group) could agree on the validity, relevance, and usefulness of Wolin's model and its implications, there was wider agreement on the model's ability to generate broad major questions often neglected in the pursuit of empirical political data. Three of these major questions were formulated and expressed as follows:

(1) What shapes might a future society take?

(2) Given these futures, what role might education take?

(3) How might alternative futures be changed and at what price? - including the question of how the relationship between politics and education might change in the future.

In answer to those, particularly in the meetings of all conference participants, who challenged such formulations as illegitimate, arrogant, or unanswerable, Heinz Eulau argued that indeed the construction of futuristic models was a legitimate task of political science (a la Lasswell), especially when linked to and used to shed light on the present. On the other hand, Professor Eulau criticized Wolin's model for failing to provide the requisite connections between his hypothesized future and a past and present. Wolin, it was argued, failed to present an empirical basis for his model either in the from of trend lines based on present empirical data or selected

empirical indicators for the future society he was attempting to describe. Eulau further criticized Wolin's model for failing to provide these same linkages in terms of measurable political variables, such as the composition and behavior of elites. In any case, as was indicated above, many conference participants were willing to accept the validity of questions of alternative futures as research pursuits, while taking exception to the validity of Wolin's particular model.

A second and related phase of the discussion of the research concerns of Cluster I focused on Wolin's notion that because of the implications of his notion of the technological society, that the role of education in the future might be constructed to be "counter-political." Because of the inchoate nature of his theoretical conceptions, Wolin neither could nor would specify the nature of his concept of "counter-politics, "but it was clear that the notion was neither "anti-political" nor "non-political" in substance. Rather what was implied here is that once the characteristics of the technological society (or at least some of the concepts therein) is accepted, that one must then distinguish between its fortuitous and its destructive aspects. According to Wolin's conceptualization, inherent in certain tendencies of the technological society, such as the growth of interlocking control and the demand for increased efficiency, there are clear and present threats to both human and democratic values, and that these threats have become increasingly manifest in contemporary America. (It became clear during the conference that Wolin's paradigm was largely one of "incipient evil, "-evil derived from the imminent values of the technological society).

It was in the context of these destructive tendencies of the techno-

logical society that Wolin prescribed educational institutions that were to be "counter-political" - that is, counter to the destructive thrusts of the technological society. The role of the educational system in his formulation thus becomes to teach people to question, if not resist, many of the societal forces acting upon them. This was not, Wolin argued, a defense of traditional liberal arts or humanistic curricula as it questioned the rational objectivist values which lay at the base of such curricula. A "counter-political" educational system would in contrast, value personal expression and subjectivity. However, Wolin's "counter-culture" is not the privatized withdrawal from society. His concern is rather to assure that educational programs will not serve only the manifest requirements of efficient technology, even on the consumer side of that technology. A counter-system education would build into the curriculum the direct examination of the society's assumptions and practices so that <u>within the system</u> a critical dialogue could be maintained and support a dialectic of social change.

Objections to Wolin's formulation of a "counter-political" educational system came rapidly and heavily, particularly when presented to the entire group of conference participants. In general, those who objected fell into three categories: (a) those who were willing to accept Wolin's notion of education as "counter-political," or at least to allow education the role of critic and innovator, but who had serious doubts about the ability of a society to tolerate such diviant institutions, (b) those who wondered if such a counter-cultural role could be institutionalized and still survive, e.g., could the state actually fund a "counter-political" university without compromising the thrust of its counter-politics. Here

it was suggested that in order to be truly "counter-political" a movement, group, or institution would almost by definition have to stay outside of established systems; and (c) those who thought it was beyond the jurisdiction of political scientists to prescribe the context and structure of educational institutions.

The final phase of the discussion of Cluster I's research concerns centered on the implications of the questions raised for research designs in the study of politics and education. Because of the broad and assumptive nature of the issues raised in Cluster I, the proposals for research scattered in various directions and were expressed at various levels of generality. No concrete list of research proposals emerged in Cluster I's final report, nor was a specific list of priorities proposed. (In fairness, it should be added that the topic faced by Cluster I was not amenable to the completion of such tasks in a week's time.) Instead we are forced to present our own distillation of research proposals, based on the conference papers, discussions, and Cluster I's final report.

The broadest of the proposals made by Cluster I was by Wolin himself, who advocated that a small number of political "theorists" or "thinkers," (who would be "relatively easily identifiable" in the field) be subsidized for one or two years for the development of new paradigms for the study of politics and education. Whether these paradigms would turn out to be those of the technological society or not would make little difference. The important task would be the identification of a <u>range of alternative futures</u>. Or as Norton Long put it, the task would be to develop ways of thinking about our society's problems in a way that solutions are not inhibited. In

short, it was proposed to support people who are judged to be good bets for critical insights into societal patterns and institutional linkages and their implications. Here capacity for critical thought and willingness to give sustained, disciplined attention to broad problems would be more important than fully elaborated research designs.

The remaining, and more specific, proposals for research generally fell into two categories: (a) those that emphasized education, educational institutions or the educational system as independent variable(s) with impact on the individual as the dependent variable, and (b) those that used the political system, or sets of political variables, as the dependent variable in the study. No typology is ever completely satisfactory, but this one adequately represents the two major thrusts of suggested research designs.

In the former category were basically four proposals:

(1) a study of what makes individuals adaptive to change, and what role education might play in such a process. The concern here was that if technology creates a rapidly changing environment, then education should strive to produce individuals capable of dealing with change. At one level the rapidity of technology induced change might lead us to study an educational program that stressed modes of inquiry and "learning about learning" rather than conveying a particular body of knowledge or set of skills. At another level, how does one teach a child so as to induce adaptive openness toward change? It is a matter for research to establish a) what images of time and of the flow of events through time people hold, b) how and when these are acquired, c) what consequences these images have for adaptiveness and for other basic social postures and predispositions, and d) how alternative educational processes might alter these images of social and historical time.

(2) a study of how in a consumption culture, "connoiseurship", or the ability to descriminate with taste might be taught. In the technological society, the student grows up to be a consumer. What are the implications of this for education? How might education prepare students for this role?

(3) a study of how primary and secondary education might be made less monolithic, i.e., more responsive to differing types of individuals. In the technological society, for example, the large comprehensive high school has become the norm. Is it this kind of standardization and size we want in our educational institutions? Can we provide alternatives and options for various kinds of individuals? Two studies that were suggested by conference participants focussed on the politics of a) alternative and/or "free" schools, and b) of the tuition voucher system. The former proposal would involve such questions as the political use of state regulations to close down alternative and/or "free" schools. The latter would involve examination of experimental uses of the voucher system (as in Christopher Jeneks' program), in terms of various political variables; and

(4) a study of how structural changes produce changes in values and value orientations. Here the focus was on researchable questions of what happens to individuals in schools, and how schools might be changed to produce different value structures in individuals. Again it was proposed to study the impact of alternative structures and changes in existing structures of education.

In the latter category of the research proposals of Cluster I come a set of suggestions in five areas:

(1) a study of the future orientation of educational elites. As

Salisbury explains, opinion research has too seldom tapped the projective side of the ways people look at the world. To draw out and articulate what are now half-formed and inarticulate preferences might reveal, among other things, a greater range of political alternatives than we now believe exists.

(2) a study of change in professions to assess both the effect on the authority structure of the profession and on the behavior of the professionals in the public order. Has there been any change in the professions - law, medicine, engineering, etc.? If so, in what areas, and what impact has it had on the authority structure of the profession, and the behavior of the professionals? For example, what is the meaning of such phenomena as community clinics run by medical students, or community legal services donated by law students?

(3) an examination of the cost factor of alternatives both within and outside the present educational system. Here the basic issue is incremental change within system versus changing the system itself. To what extent can desired changes be carried out within the present educational system? Or, as Wolin has suggested, have we reached a point where significant alternations will only occur outside the present system? Which direction is more costly? Here "costs" referred to <u>both</u> political and economic costs.

(4) a study of what strategies produce structural changes in the educational system. If one assumes that significant changes can be induced within the present educational system, how are such changes to be introduced? Is it possible to get beyond those traditional case studies in the education literature, e.g., "how bond issue X was passed

in County Y," into a new theoretical area of political strategies in education? and

(5) a study of how a new set of orientations becomes a political paradigm. On the one hand,it was suggested that there be studies of the development of political paradigms in textbooks and curriculum materials (e.g. see Greenberg paper), or those paradigms held by elites (e.g. see Salisbury paper). On the other hand, studies of how ideological symbols get into schools and become legitimate were proposed. Here the suggested pattern of studies was to investigate how schools and school systems deal with such phenomena as a) elections, b) the presidency, c) the draft, d) the Vietnam war, and e) the legal system and legal rights. The need for longitudinal as well as cross sectional studies in this area was stressed.

This list gives us little in the way of clues as to where to start, for Cluster I never attempted to assign definitive research priorities. However, Sheldon Wolin did give us a clue as to his own set of priorities. According to Wolin, the basic problem our society, as well as our educational and political systems, is change. Citing the case of the university in the past five years, Wolin argued that often by the time we study a system, it's gone in the form we knew it. The great priority, Wolin continued, is for future study in the area of politics and education to be more projective.

But, lest it be underestimated, Wolin's argument for priorities should be examined in the light of a new and prominent branch of research (largely funded by USOE) in the study of politics and education, that of "alternative future histories." Groups like the Educational Policy

Research Center of the Stanford Research Institute (Menlo Park, California) and Johnson Research Associates (Santa Barbara, California) have constructed as many as 40 future histories for the purpose of investigating their educational policy implications. In a report based on their work EPRC/SRI and Johnson Associates, report that there are very few plausible future histories which avoid some period of serious trouble between now and 2050. The few that do, moreover, seem to require "a dramatic shift of values and perceptions with regard to what we come to term the, world macroproblem'." As the report further explains,

> This macroproblem will be the predominant concern of the foreseeable future for all the alternative paths. It is the composite of all the problems that have been brought about by a combination of rampant technology application and industrial development, together with high population levels (in turn, a consequence of technology-reduced mortality rate). These fall mainly into three groups: problems of the ecosystem; technological threats of various kinds; and an intrinsically expanding "have - have-not" gap (increasingly seen as unjust exploitation of the have-nots). It is so named since the problems are mutually exacerbating and since there appears to be high likelihood that they can be solved only in systematic fashion and not piecemeal. Further, it appears that although various aspects of the world macroproblem may be ameliorated or postponed by certain technological achievements, its nexus is intrinsic in the basic operative premises of the present Western industrialized culture. If this is correct, then it follows that education toward changing those premises, directly or indirectly, is the paramount educational task for the United States and for the world. This means that education should be directed toward responsible stewardship of life on earth with the associated changes in values and premises that are necessary for this shift.
>
> (Quoted from W.W. Harman, O.W. Markley, and Russell Rhyne, "The Forecasting of Plausible Alternative Future Histories: A Progress Report of Methods, Tentative Results, and Educational Policy Implications," -- abstract, p. 6)

It is just the kind of priority suggested by this report that

the members of Cluster I were concerned with. However, as political scientists, we would suggest that residual questions remain which are of particular relevance to our discipline. First of all, there is a clear implication in the passage cited above that the key independent variable in long range systemic change is the education system while the political system is the dependent variable -- an assumption which, as Professor Eulau points out in his paper, is open to serious question. Secondly, the authors of the cited passage, and rightly so given their concerns, concentrate on the shape of the educational system. Yet the question remains, given the kind of concerns expressed, what should a future-oriented political system look like.

Therefore, given the nature of these residual questions, we would suggest (using some poetic license) that the kind of priorities that Cluster I would finally propose would be as follows: First, that research attention should be deovted to the construction and explication of futuristic model(s) of the political system which allow for the solution of such "macroproblems" as might be facing our society, and which at the same time delineate both the nature and direction of the relationship between political and educational institutions; secondly, that the construction and existence of such models be validated by studies of past and present trends in the political system, e.g. that Wolin's assertion that technological society accentuates concentration of power and influence by empirically demonstrated, and at a third level of priority, case studies of structural changes in both the educational and political systems in terms of the kind of values and value orientations they produce (i.e. do they provide the kind of value orientations that

allow for the solution of these "macro-problems.") This last level would include experimental and quasi-experimental research into alternative institutional arrangements.

In conclusion, it might be said again that Cluster I's lack of closure was largely due to the nature of the task. When a group's basic task is to examine the normative assumptions behind the goals and objectives of the study of politics and education, a few days of discussion, however, intensive, will hardly suffice. In the long-run, however, and especially if Professor Wolin and others are right, it may prove to have been the most crucial topic.

Research Guidelines: Cluster II

As the title of this Cluster indicates (i.e., "The Political Education of Youth: New Directions in Research on Political Socialization Including Cross Cultural Studies"), the participants, in contrast to Cluster I, took as their starting point a relatively well-defined and prominent branch of research in the study of politics and education (although a recent one), that of political socialization research. Here the issue became one of defining what directions this branch of research should take in the 1970's and beyond. Once more, this problem was confronted both in intra-societal and comparative terms.

To the extent that a trend has been identifiable, political socialization research on education has commonly focused on what is learned about the political system in schools. Moreover, the prototype studies in the field (e.g., those of Hess and Easton) tended to concentrate on what political norms were learned in school and the degree to which these norms contributed to the stability of the political system. Yet, as the late 1960's approached, these cross-sectional studies of the late 1950's and early 60's seemed less and less explanatory of the empirical data on school disruption, student alienation, and the general trend toward increased student activism on political issues. Without examining in detail all aspects of the early models of political socialization, suffice it to say that their emphasis on the transmission of adult political norms, knowledge, beliefs, and orientations to pre-adults was faced by an increasing number of anomalies in the schools of the late 1960's.

It is against this kind of conceptualization of the political

socialization process that the members of Cluster II were reacting, albeit in a positive sense. For example, Robert Hess himself sent a provacative memo to the conference participants in which the following points were made:

> The contemporary scene is obviously quite different and it is difficult to explain it by applying traditional models of socialization to political attitudes and especially to political behavior in young people. . .It seemed to me a couple of years ago that a model of political learning which made allowance for acquiring political attitudes and behavior from peers was more realistic than a model which conceptualized socialization as the transmission of belief systems and behavior patterns from the adults to the pre-adults. I found the notion of political learning more comfortable than political socialization in attempting to understand anti-establishment feelings and activities on the part of students and other minority groups. It was not completely satisfactory, but it helped me move out of a too-rigid way of thinking about the growth of citizen-type behavior.

It was in this spirit, one critical of previous models and designs in the field of political socialization research on schools, that the discussion and final report of Cluster II were framed. In an effort to overcome the conceptual limitations of previous models, Cluster II stressed two criteria which they felt should be invoked in researching the political effects on youth of schools and schooling.

First of all, they argued that research questions in this field should represent a clear point of connection between political learning and the schooling experience. Here an attempt was clearly made to separate the concerns of Cluster II from conventional political socialization designs. As was indicated above, the conventional design incorporates political data in schools, but very little data relevant to the nexus between politics and schooling. For example, it is only necessary to collect surveys of political

attitudes found in school children, but also investigate how and to what extent the authority structure of the school and/or classroom shapes attitudes which are transferred to the political system. It is this kind of connectedness between education and politics that merits research attention, according to Cluster II. The implication here is that research should focus on phenomena which are simultaneously affected by educational and political processes. It is also implied that findings should enrich theory-building about both schooling and political life.

Secondly, the members of Cluster II maintained that research should not separate the learner, the learning, and the learned from the structures of society. This criterion implies more than the conventional injunction that students should not, for purposes of research, be lifted from their learning environment (though the importance of this injunction is acknowledged). Here the thrust, as in the case of the first criterion, is toward a widening of conceptualization of the political learning process which, in turn, it is hoped will increase the explanatory power of theory in this area. The emphasis in this context is on a research program which investigates political learning by also investigating social and political stratification, the criteria of political and social differentiation, and the conditions of access and influence. (For examples of such research designs, see the papers of Meyer and Prewitt.) Schooling, it is argued, is socially chartered to direct students toward adult social and political status positions, and through credentialing activities, schools define these positions as well as legitimate the assignment of differentially educated people to them. In so doing schools are affected by and affect the structures of society.

While in isolation these ideas might seem somewhat commonplace, in the context of political socialization they could mark a significant shift of emphasis. As Kenneth Prewitt put it at the conference, it is time to realize that there is a politics of learning as well as a learning of politics. In other words, what is learned in schools is determined to some extent by certain political and social variables (in turn traceable to other structures in the society). What these variables are is not altogether clear at this point, But Cluster II could delineate certain areas for investigations as possible independent variables in the case of political learning in the schooling process.

Of course, the teaching and learning process is the arena in which political norms and behavior are transmitted to students. The formal curriculum has obvious effects on students which must be investigated. In large measure, they result from, and affect, the expectations which students and others have about schooling. However, the expectations of school and political leaders themselves influence and are influenced by attributes of teaching and learning contexts -- attributes that may reinforce, negate, or have no influence on the social and citizenship norms and behavior which are acquired. Thus, in any investigation of the political meaning of the schooling process, the kind of independent variables we would have to consider would be as follows:

(a) Students have expectations about education; in particular its methods for judging their social and citizenship accomplishments. Parents, peers, and teachers all influence the individual directly and through their expectations about the life chances and roles which schools control, and what they are supposed to do in sorting out students among the political

and economic strata of society. Agencies of schooling, such as testing and curriculum, produce these effects. It is imperative to know how these expectations of school and student influence the political attitudes and actions the young adopt as they become functional members of the polity and the economy.

(b) If the schools are expected to operate in major ways to differentiate political elites and followers, then these expectations and their structural reality are themselves an important source of school effects. Schools exist in a larger structural context than that of teacher-classroom-student; the elements of which play crucial roles in defining the schools' right to train, influence, and allocate students. Civil service rules, the orientations of political elites, occupational gate-keepers, and dominant myths about the social and political nature of schooling affect the political expectations and activities which schools create in their students.

(c) The academic core of teaching and learning is a critical, and often neglected source of political learning. Expectations of academic performance by students and elites importantly shape the extent to which groups regard education as an agency to influence the allocation of political and economic resources, the distribution of those resources, and the creation of norms and experiences designed to attain the objectives in mind. In particular, the political significance of learning, credentials, and grading needs to be seen as a source of other citizenship and social outcomes we have stressed.

(d) The social context of education in the schools contains elements of conflict and participation designed to influence the distribution of re-

wards and sanctions and future sorting into the political and economic domains. Once more it is imperative to understand the expectations of students and those who govern the schools about the scope and qualities of participation. Moreover, expectations and behavior in response to political conflict about the assignment of citizenship rights and duties need to be investigated as sources of political socialization.

Thus, in this set of variables, Cluster II has attempted, consistent with the criteria it set, to get at the nexus between politics and schooling, while at the same time connecting these processes to the larger structures of the society. In this context what was stressed was that persons who control educational resources, and thereby shape educational institutions, have assumptions about society. Moreover, they have assumptions about how children should be prepared for membership in the society. These assumptions serve as reference points during times of choice regarding the allocation of resources. However, implicitly held and however variable across the relevant population, these assumptions become translated into legitimate and authoritative curricula, teacher training and selection, testing procedures, extracurricular programs, and so forth. Providing a socially sanctioned and institutional setting for the political learning of children reflects an attempt, albeit a clumsy one, to prepare children for membership in the civil and commercial adult society, and to define such membership.

Using this mode of analysis, the members of Cluster II concluded that in important ways the experience of being "educated" is to be sorted into groups which vary widely in cognitive development, relevant skills and talents, self-esteem, access and influence, social status, cultural norms,and so forth. This grouping process in part assigns students to different political and

social statuses. Moreover, persons not currently in schools recognize the connection between differential education and the different groupings, and thus the impact of the school is to be traced into populations other than students.

Given the nature of these observations, Cluster II was led to an emphasis on specific types of dependent variables, particularly variables linked to the ambiguities and expectations associated with political citizenship, and variables linked to the privileges and penalties associated with different levels of social status. The bulk of the discussion in Cluster II was spent on the development of these dependent variables, as it was felt, with justification, that the range of variables in previous political socialization research has been limited and confining (e.g., see Weiler's paper). While it would be impossible to recount their discussion of these variables, let us present their own summary of these variables from their final report. The dependent variables were divided into four areas:

(a) Political systems are characterized by significant, if varying, degrees of conflict over both specific policy issues and more fundamental normative assumptions about the goals to be achieved through the system's operation. While some political norms are shared by the members of the system, others are controversial and become subject to more or less polarized opinions and beliefs. The citizen's role comprises both agreement and disagreement, both consent and dissent, both acceptance and rejection of others' beliefs and behaviors. His socialization into the world of politics will have to be conceived in such a way as to reflect the condition

of conflict under which his role is performed. Whether as a result of deliberate direction or not, the various processes of learning about politics result in the acquisition of cognitive and evaluative orientations towards diversity, dissent, and conflict. Thus, measuring the degree to which, and the conditions under which dissenting individuals and groups in the system are tolerated in the attitudes and practical behavior of socializees becomes an important further dimension in the study of political socialization.

(b) Both the assumptions guiding the role of the school in the process of political learning, and its actual effect on the results of the learning process, are subject to being at variance with the expectations held by significant other groups in the system, especially under conditions of rapid change and/or substantial cleavages within the society. The resultant discontinuities and inconsistencies create situations of stress, and uncertainty and social change. The capacities for handling such situations has to be conceived as a function of certain role norms which may or may not have been acquired in the socialization process. The ability and willingness to tolerate stress and uncertainty does, therefore, become a variable directly relevant to understanding the process of change which results from the lack of congruence between societal expectations and socialization outcomes. At the institutional level, it is important to examine the ways social changes may follow from incongruities between training expectations and principles of social allocation built into the educational system (and those held in the wider society).

(c) Schools both create political attitudes, and quite independently affect the actual political activity of their products. A causal chain leads

from schools through their immediate consequences on students to these students' ultimate participation in the political order. But there is a more direct effect. Schools are chartered with the right to allocate students into the various differentiated parts of the political order. This authority operates to socially locate students and to affect their roles and activity quite apart from any immediate effects it may have (perhaps operating through anticipatory socialization) on their attitudes. And because the authority of schools to allocate students into social and political positions occurs over long periods of time, their effects must be examined by long-term longitudinal research. School effects will appear quite different, and operate through different mechanisms if we study their products much later than if we study them while they are still students.

Further, if schools have the social authority to lead their students in actual political participation during the educational process itself, they greatly affect the present and later participation of these students. Student groups in many societies are participating political elites, as the social boundaries of the educational system are extended to include parts of the political system itself. Through such processes attitudes may be affected, but activity is directly created by the institutional structure.

(d) School structures provide an important means of legitimating a whole system of inequalities, both in the eyes of students or graduates, and in the view of large sectors of the adult population. The chartering of a given set of schools with the authority to allocate present rights and future roles to students may have crucial effects on many parts of the

society -- quite beyond the student population being socialized. School structures, and the charters or rights of allocation on which they are based, provide a basis for many myths about equality, the rights of citizens, and the rights of elites. Is it not surprising that we rely so much, in modern societies, on the specialized competences of professionals who we privately may suspect of having training of dubious utility? And is it not surprising that we place the ultimate powers in the hands of ordinary citizens whose every idea we suspect? Clearly we explain and justify these extraordinary concessions partly by referring to the charter and presumed effects of the various parts of the educational system. These institutions, if they do nothing else, provide comforting and stabilizing justifications of our dependence on both elite and citizen. Whether or not an educational system improves the political competence of these parties, it helps to provide a legitimization of their "proper" participant roles.

It is necessary to investigate the consequences of the development of educational systems, and the expansion or contraction of their authority over political instruction and allocation; for all sorts of groups in the political system, not only the students themselves.

As valuable as this discussion of dependent variables is in terms of broad insights into the impact of the schooling process on political learning, it is hardly specific enough to provide us with a clear set of research priorities in the field of politics and education. Yet Cluster II did attempt to briefly define four areas which they thought were essential to the variables they emphasized and the kind of social reality they were attempting to describe. This is as close as Cluster II came to setting

research priorities and indicating specific research designs (beyond those developed in their individual conference papers). These are the areas Cluster II considered most significant for further exploration:

1) In order to trace the development of political norms and styles of political activity among adults and to understand the unfolding of the social sorting and selecting process, some indicators must be collected longitudinally. Such effects can be traced to characteristics of schools and schooling only (if at all!) through longitudinal research in which those who are subjected to different schooling patterns are observed as they progress through later life.

2) Identification of schooling patterns which are likely to make a difference in later political life and their isolation in quasi-experimental designs using 'field experiments' will conserve research funds and simplify data analysis. We can stage experiments (as Ed Litt suggests) or take advantage of the wide variations which already exist in the schooling patterns in this country and abroad.

3) The use of field experiments implies the preservation of contextual elements of the data. Concepts like conflict, consensus, status allocation, or docility must be operationalized in ways which have meaning for the contexts in which they are observed. If, for example, we posit different results from schoolings provided blacks and whites in American schools, we must be certain that the concepts have valid meaning in both contexts even if that requires that we use somewhat different measures of the concept for each social group. Expectations about the consequences of schooling may not only be different among several social groups or geographical area but they may also exist along different dimensions.

4) In order to obtain data about expectations and the cognitive maps of the educational process from students and non-students, individuals must be approached as informants as well as respondents. The picture of reality that individuals perceive are evoked by quite unstructured interviews while responses to particular attitudinal and behavioral stimuli provide data about norms and role perceptions in situations that are highly structured by the researcher. How individuals see the effects of schooling is as important (or more so) as the roles and norms that are evoked by the researcher's structured inquiries.

In summary, the members of Cluster II, given the nature of their stated interests, would probably suggest the following kind of priority for the further study of the political education of youth. Cluster II, it seems, would choose to direct research into the "nexus" between politics and schooling. They would emphasize the study of certain phenomena in the schooling experience which are simultaneously affected by educational and political processes. To use Kenneth Prewitt's phrase again, it is time to recognize that there is a "politics of learning" as well as a learning of politics in school.

In this context, Cluster II calls for the use of a set of independent variables in future studies which will place political learning in a wider social context. To what extent, it is asked, is what is learned in the schools traceable to other structures in the society (and, in particular to the patterns and criteria for political and social differentiation)? At another level, Cluster II would call for the expansion of the kind of dependent variables used in studies of the political education of youth. Can we ascertain, it is asked, the different kinds of political learning

that result from variance in the school experiences of youth? In approaching such questions, Cluster II suggests a wide variety of research designs (depending on the scope of the question), including survey, longitudinal, experimental and quasi-experimental designs.

RESEARCH GUIDELINES FOR CLUSTER III

Major Areas of Consideration: General Research Guidelines

In a meeting where ideas are many but the focus is uncertain, some scatteration follows in any presentation of the outcome. Several themes appeared. These are statements of what this cluster believed it is important to study in understanding the politics of education. Among these themes will be found ideas in many of the papers offered under Cluster III and IV; additions arose out of the group sessions. At the present time, we can not rank order the specific research suggestions discussed below. We began with some general considerations and then moved to some proposed thrusts.

1. Given the great variety of American school systems, how can we generalize about their politics? Whether the element of these systems we wish to understand is, in Eastonian terms of environment, needs and demands, policy conversion, or outputs, we must work toward classificatory schemes which emphasize comparative analysis. This theme had several, oft-repeated insistences. The case-study alone, selected randomly or fortuitously, is obviously inadequate to this task. Macroanalysis provides more answers, of course, but it alone often masks important political variables and is also insufficient. Much was heard about the need to match macroanalytic survey results with identification of deviant cases (e.g. high achieving slum schools, free schools) for the illumination they provide of the norm from which they deviate. In short, typologies are useful as long as they are exposed to aggregate data for the distributional or developmental lessons they may provide.

2. Whether the focus of policy research should be upon the total

process in which policy is born, authorized, and administered, or whether the focus should be upon one level with a range of policies operating, is a query of some disagreement. But most participants stressed the former, insisting upon the need to understand policy primarily by following it vertically through all levels of government from the federal government to class room units. This permits developmental analysis for a given policy, demonstrates all the operative forces at work, and encourages theory building about the life histories -- or pathologies -- of policy. Yet horizontal focus upon one unit of decision-making -- Washington's Office of Education or the East Hogsville, Ark. School District -- enables us to see what is happening to an array of policies (curriculum, integration, teacher re-training, etc.) in the conversion-output-outcome chain. In this way we can build toward general theory that spans sub-system decisional structures.

Note, however, two aspects of either analytical framework. Each partakes of the case-study, whether it is a single policy studied through vertical layers of decisional apparatuses or a single layer through which an array of policies are viewed. Second, little of either kind of study exists in the literature. More typically, studies consist of one phase and substantive focus of the policy process, e.g., policy conversion alone (Congress makes a law, the school board finally votes to accept sex education courses). Or, there may be a review of a few policy decisions at one level, but certainly not the full range which commands the energies and other resources of the local school system. The absence of research fitting either of the two alternative approaches may well be an indication of the difficulty and expense of execution each involves. In light of the paucity of research via either alternative, the resolution of the

methodological debate awaits more research along both lines. Regardless of which option is pursued, more will certainly be assembled than we presently have.

Two Specific Research Projects

The subject of innovation or educational change enjoyed considerable importance, to judge from the time spent on dissecting its phases for future analysis. There were suggestions about uncovering peer clusters, and information circuits as one way of finding how new ideas might get effectively to policy-makers*. Curriculum innovation as a specific policy study was urged, particularly in light of the disappointing evaluation methods presently employed to urge or continue such new notions. Strategies for achieving innovation were urged as highly useful information for policy-makers, particularly given the capacity of the school bureaucracy to absorb or deflect innovative thrusts into their territory.

The basic framework of analysis underlying these suggestions seems to run as follows. There is imputed a chain of innovation which theoretically underlies the adoption of any new policy into a closed system. Thus, how do ideas enter a system (what are the communication chains which filter novelty to powerful people so that they perceive it?) Next, how does the perceived innovation differentially affect actors so as to cause them to use their resources to oppose or defend it? Finally, once accepted in policy form, how does it affect the school system? The pay-off for acquiring such knowledge of the innovation process is a wiser use of resources by those wishing to introduce innovation. Note that basic to all

---

* One study was specifically cited that found certain leading lighthouse superintendents and school districts that many of its neighbors followed.

this is the assumption that innovation means improvement, namely, that the difference between present and desired conditions can be narrowed by a new policy. This is not the only place where normative judgements were brought to bear upon empirical propositions.

The special independent force exerted by the quality of leadership upon policy decisions appeared in several forms. One specific proposal suggested viewing superintendents in some typological fashion (Heroes and Bums) to see what differences in policy outcomes were associated with each. Such categorization of leaders matched with policy differences appeared in less conceptual terms in numerous anecdotes of what specific superintendents did under given circumstances with what consequences. Or, given the constraints which are imposed upon policy by structural characteristics of place (which may be inferred from some macroanalysis), how much independent effect exists for personal leadership under what kind of conditions (e.g., at what level can a hero make a difference)? How much of this independent personal force is diluted by decisions made outside the jurisdiction of the leader, e.g., USOE guidelines, court orders, professional certification requirements?

Such a general inquiry was widely discussed and approved, but one counter-suggestion should be noted. If one finds the difference which personal leadership qualities can make, but these are absent in given locales, maybe then we need systemic explanations for policy change. Knowing these it would be possible in the absence of leadership to gauge better what can be done.

What is the Dependent Variable

A theme of constant recurrence was dissatisfaction over the kind

of dependent variables to be studied. There was little enthusiasm for studying the political process only (such as board elections as an end in itself). All agreed that it was imperative to focus upon policy or outputs that are "important" (e.g., who benefits). Possible benefits ranged from financial inputs to changes in achievement test scores or self-concept. But without agreement otherwise upon what "important" means, studying policy should not be studying only conversion and leaving out the more vital question -- what difference does the conversion make for the society in which it takes place? The search for such notions of significant outcomes against which to measure results was inherent in every theme outlined above. Classification in the sense of morphology is not sufficient; what difference in policy outcome is associated with differences, in forms, structures, processes, personalities, etc.? Whether studying the vertical or horizontal policy process, the pay-off will be what difference the process or the level makes for the real world in which it operates -- and that means an evaluation of effects upon important outcomes. Innovation is not important either, unless we know what the desired end it is we have in view, and hence wish to achieve by policy change. Obviously an evalution of the effect of leadership must proceed within the framework of knowing the answer to the question: leadership for what ends?

Various suggestions floated in the air about what the important dependent variables were. "Docility" and educational achievement had its numerous champions; "accountability" and institutionalization of a counter culture were offered; and at the plenary session pleas for "being free" or "happy" will be recalled. But the free-floating anxiety about

this problem never focused. One participant noted that uncertainty about the dependent variable gave an air of unreality to discussion about methodology and research strategies. Yet others noted that the public was becoming increasingly concerned about productivity in their schools, although what that meant at times, one suggested and others supported, was a docile, controlled student body. Part of our inability to identify dependent variables was caused by the lack of learning theory and inconclusiveness of studies like the Coleman report.

Other Themes

Although most of the discussion was conducted loosely within the input-conversion-output framework, certain types of research which do not fall clearly within these categories were felt by some to be of value as well. First, Easton himself would emphasize that analysis of value allocation may be no more important than analysis of the way in which political structures seek to maintain their legitimacy. The crisis in contemporary education may not be simply (or even primarily) an allocative crisis. It is quite possible the crisis centers over the symbol of legitimacy. The way in which systems respond (or fail to respond) to the demands articulated by new social forces, and the consequences of these processes for the legitimacy of the system itself was felt to be a significant area of inquiry. Looked at from this perspective, the study of who governs may not simply be acting as a court chronicler to King Lee, but a matter as critically significant as the examination of the consequences of their governing.

Secondly, the tools of political analysis might also be applied to the evaluation of current policy proposals, such as state wide bargaining

between teachers and the authorities, the movement towards community control, and changes in state aid formulae. The political consequences of these proposals need to be considered systematically before hasty adoption. For instance, on the one hand we see a movement for centralized control through such devices as Program Planning Budgeting Systems and teacher accountability. On the other, we see movements for community control, free schools, and storefront academies. What are the changes in the locus of political influence under these alternatives? Do school professionals still dominate?

Thirdly, it was suggested that macroanalyses of the contours of the American educational system and its relation to American politics and society more generally might clarify the parameters of the system within which variations in the policy-making process occur. As mentioned in the general sessions, such macroanalysis might be profitably undertaken from an international comparative perspective,such a study would demonstrate that the values parameters tkae in the American context are not universal constants.

Fourthly, in any analysis of policy the distinction between policy adoption and policy implementation is critical. The character of the organization responsible for "actualizing" policies becomes such a crucial aspect of the policy process that it deserves special attention. Little is known about administrative politics and the way this affects educational policy. Likewise, little is known about intra-district variations in educational practice and results . . . what goes on within individual schools and classrooms. Does the bureaucracy form a barrier (as conventionally defined) and educational outcomes? Do educational administrators

shape the agenda of decision-making so that crucial questions are kept solely within their purview?

A related issue stressed by Professor LaNoue is the political aspects of teacher accountability. If the development of objective criteria for teaching performance (e.g. achievement tests) may take too long and require too much emphasis on "knowledge bits," perhaps there is some value in examining the method of peer group standards that are used in higher education to achieve quality control to see if any of it is transferable to public education. The implementation of the higher education model, however, would be impeded by the tendency for collective bargaining agreements to dictate the outcome of many policy issues. Increasingly, decisions like student discipline, compensatory opportunities, and ethnic studies are made through collective bargaining. Consequently, political scientists need to investigate these collective bargaining trends and their implications for accountability. Neither research into peer group processes nor collective bargaining takes us very far into the problem of accountability for socialization. One way to further accountability is to research the nature and intensity of the public's value preferences regarding education. A follow-up study could collect information on how the school system had responded to the value choices expressed by its citizens.

Summary

There was general agreement that any proposed research project in this cluster should be comparative and work toward classificatory schemes which assist us in generalizing about the great variety of American schools. Within this overall guideline two thrusts were viewed as most important: 1) following a policy through all levels of government from the federal

government to classroom units; 2) exploration of a wide array of substantive policies at anyone unit and level of decision-making.

A high priority for the first thrust would be to explore the chain of innovation around some important policy area such as curriculum. The second thrust could be implemented with great potential through a focus on the special independent force exerted by the quality of local school superintendent's leadership.

Other areas that deserve urgent consideration for research support are the political legitimacy of contemporary educational institutions, and accountability.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

This report has attempted to accurately synthesize and interpret the outcome of a five day conference. The individual papers were only summarized briefly and contained many good ideas for further research. The major theme in most of the papers was discussed and is reflected to some degree in this report. However, the treatment here could not convey the full argument or analysis in most papers. Consequently, the reader is urged to review each of the papers individually.

The conference was successful in bringing out many new ideas and good research projects in educational politics. The priorities are inherent in the major areas of concentration in the discussion and the conclusions of each cluster. An analysis of gaps was not difficult given the paucity of past research. In short, the research projects and approaches included in this report all deal with gap areas. We have attempted at the end of each cluster to tackle the questions of which individual projects should be undertaken first because they would contribute most to later projects.

We were not successful in defining the specific limits or nature of the intersect of politics of education. We could not rank order proposed research endeavors or some scale of utility. We could not do this because the state of the art, empirical base, and theoretical frameworks in political science and education are not sufficiently developed. The difficulty in specifying dependent variables discussed by every cluster is a good example of the above limitations. The problems in establishing a dependent variable for cluster's I and II stems primarily from the lackoof political theory and data. For Cluster III the dependent variable

problem is basically caused by the inability of practicing educators and educational researchers to agree on the most important "goals" of schools (achievement versus other outcomes) and to discover education production functions.

It would have been extremely helpful if theories could be borrowed from political science to guide priority setting and to explore the boundaries between education and politics. As Landau pointed out, however, this discipline is marked by a "high information level and low theoretic yield."[2] Unfortunately politics of education is not one of the areas where the discipline has chosen to focus or develop a high information level. Consequently, a decision on which of the research endeavors discussed here should come first is difficult to answer from the standpoint of theory but relatively simple if one looks at unexplored substantive areas.

In sum, the conference and the papers were replete with specific suggestions for urgently needed research in politics of education. The conferences felt each of the specific research thrusts could be grouped under one of three different clusters of interests and fact. There was no logical way to decide which of the three clusters deserves highest priority. Within each cluster, however, there was substantial agreement on the desirability of using specific new paradigms. The relative importance of certain research projects in each cluster is covered in the reports of the proceedings.

It is difficult in a report of this nature to convey the tone of the conference that political research should receive sufficient support to begin work soon on the agenda described herein. The concepts of "crisis"

[2] Martin Landau, "On the Use of Functional Analysis in American Political Science," Social Research 35 48-75; 1968

and "turning point" were used frequently to describe the current politics of education. There was also a general sense that the conferees had agreed on some very different conceptual approaches, had higher potential for yielding important results and were more powerful in an analytic sense.